

REMARKS

By this Response, claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, 12-17, and 19-21 remain pending.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, 12-17 and 19-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, 12-17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Shyu* (U.S. Patent No. 6,046,957). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 are directed to an SRAM device and a method of operating an SRAM device comprising, *inter alia*, providing an enhanced low operating voltage to said SRAM array during at least a portion of an active mode, said enhanced low operating voltage V_{ESS} selectively adjusted to a distinct value according to device factors and having a higher value than a low operating voltage V_{SS} , and wherein said enhanced low operating voltage V_{ESS} is provided at a lower value during a READ operation than during a WRITE operation. It is respectfully submitted that the term "enhanced low operating voltage" is different than what the Examiner appears to consider as a "high operating voltage". Applicant is specifically avoiding the known "high" operating voltage in an SRAM device in order to provide an improved SRAM device having reduced current leakage during an active mode while providing a strong SNM and write trip voltage in a manner not previously obtained in the art.

It is the Examiner's position that *Shyu* discloses an SRAM device and method as claimed and relies on Figure 5, 122; Column 2, lines 56-67; and Column 3, lines 1-5

thereof as disclosing the array low voltage control circuitry and associated claim components.

To the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosed devices of *Shyu* simply provide an ON/OFF or HIGH/LOW type of control logic for switching between a high voltage and a low voltage during a write or read operation, respectively. There is no teaching or suggestion of a selective adjustment of an enhanced low operating voltage according to device factors. Even further, *Shyu* fails to appreciate a distinction between a low voltage, enhanced low voltage, and high voltage. Given the failure of *Shyu* to teach or suggest an enhanced low operating voltage, the further characterization thereof in the dependent claims is also clearly allowable.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5-6, 8-10, 12-17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant further submits that claims 5-6, 8-10 and 12 are in condition for allowance, as are claims 13-17 and 19-21, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 12, respectively.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Devaney* (U.S. Patent No. 5,541,883). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is the Examiner's position that *Devaney* discloses an SRAM device and method as claimed and relies on Figure 1, 110; and Column 3, lines 20-27 thereof as disclosing the array low voltage control circuitry and associated claim components.

To the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that *Devanney* suffers from the same deficiency as *Shyu* noted above. Specifically, *Devanney* simply provide LOW/HIGH logic level signals at the beginning or end of a write cycle. There is no teaching or suggestion of a selective adjustment of an enhanced low operating voltage according to device factors. Even further, *Devanney* fails to appreciate a distinction between a low voltage, enhanced low voltage, and high voltage.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references applied against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: SEP 10 2007

By: Barbara A. Fisher
Barbara A. Fisher
Reg. No. 31,906

Timothy M. Hsieh
Reg. No. 42,672

MH2 Technology Law Group, LLP
1950 Kidwell Drive, Suite 550
Tysons Corner, VA 22182
Tel: 703.917.0000 x 121